

REMARKS

The Office Action dated October 4, 2005 has been received and carefully noted. The following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto. Claims 1-18 have been examined and are respectfully resubmitted for reconsideration.

Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Kardos et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,430,562). The Office Action took the position that *Kardos et al.* taught all of the elements in those claims. Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejection and assert that the claims are allowable over the art of record.

Claim 1, from which claims 2-9 depend, recites a computer aided dispatch system including a master dispatch database having one or more data tables, each data table having one or more entries, each containing information pertaining to the dispatch of services by one or more mobile units. The system also includes a central dispatch computer system capable of accessing the master dispatch database and one or more mobile terminals, having a processor and a local dispatch database. Whenever a change is made to the master dispatch database by the central dispatch computer system, the change is automatically sent by the central dispatch computer system to the one or more mobile terminals, which in turn each make a substantially similar change to its local dispatch database. The one or more mobile terminals are configured to respond to dispatches by traveling to a dispatched site and the computer aided dispatch system provides real time status information regarding calls and mobile unit availability to the one or more mobile terminals.

Claim 10, from which claims 11-18 depend, recites a method of dispatching information pertaining to requests for service from a central dispatch computer system to one or more mobile terminals including accessing and changing, by the central dispatch computer, a master dispatch database including one or more data tables, each data table having one or more entries, each containing information pertaining to the dispatch of services by one or more mobile units. The method includes automatically sending to the one or more mobile terminals change information pertaining to the change in the master dispatch database and changing a local dispatch database associated with each of the one or more mobile terminals based upon received change information. The one or more mobile terminals are configured to respond to dispatches by traveling to a dispatched site and the step of sending the change information includes providing real time status information regarding calls and mobile unit availability to the one or more mobile terminals.

As discussed in the present specification and the claims, the present invention provides real time status information regarding calls and mobile unit availability to the mobile units. It is respectfully submitted that the prior art of *Kardos et al* fails to disclose or suggest the elements of any of the presently pending claims. Therefore, the prior art fails to provide the critical and unobvious advantages discussed above.

Kardos et al. is directed to a method and system for communicating between a plurality of disparate hosts and an order processing system includes generating orders at each of the disparate hosts. The orders are transmitted from each of the hosts to a shared

message handler using relational database statements. The orders are transmitted from the relational database table structure of the shared message handler to the order processing system. Responses to the orders are received from the order processing system at the shared message handler. The statuses of the corresponding orders are updated based on the responses and provided to the disparate hosts.

Claim 1 recites, in part, “whenever a change is made to the master dispatch database by the central dispatch computer system, the change is *automatically sent* by the central dispatch computer system to the one or more mobile terminals, which in turn each *make a substantially similar change to its local dispatch database.*” Claim 1 also recites, in part, that “the one or more mobile terminals are configured to respond to dispatches by traveling to a dispatched site and the computer aided dispatch system provides real time status information regarding *calls and mobile unit availability* to the one or more mobile terminals.” Claim 10 recites similar limitations.

First, Applicants respectfully assert that *Kardos et al.* fails to teach or suggest that changes to a master database are automatically sent to the mobile terminals, as required by claims 1 and 10. The section of *Kardos et al.* relied upon as allegedly teaching that aspect is found at column 16, lines 28-42. However, that section details that work orders are “presented to the dispatchers” and not automatically sent to the mobile terminals. Cancellations and changes to work orders are also not disclosed as be sent automatically to the mobile terminals. Even if the changes to the work order statuses were sent automatically to the dispatchers, that communication would be occurring in the opposite

direction as that specified in the claims. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that at least this limitation of claims 1 and 10 is neither taught nor suggested by *Kardos et al.*

Secondly, claims 1 and 10 recite, in part that “a substantially similar change [is made] to its local dispatch database” in the mobile terminal. As disclosed in *Kardos et al.*, the nature of the “database” in the Mobile Data Terminals is not disclosed. It seems clear that the MDTs contain information about work orders, but it is not at all clear that any database in the MDTs would be at all similar to that found in the CAD server. Thus, it cannot be assumed that substantially similar change is made to a local dispatch database. “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.”

Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). As such, Applicants respectfully assert that at least this limitation of claims 1 and 10 is neither taught nor suggested by *Kardos et al.*

Lastly, claims 1 and 10 also detail that the information provided “real time status information regarding calls and mobile unit availability to the one or more mobile terminals.” *Kardos et al.* fails to teach or suggest that the real time status of mobile unit availability is provided. It is clear that the statuses of work orders are updated, but the availability of the mobile units is not considered. This is not surprising, considering that the system in *Kardos et al.* is concerned with completing work orders, while the present application is concerned with the dispatch and monitoring of services in law enforcement, fire departments and emergency medical services. The availability of mobile units is

over greater concern in the latter cases and such information is important to the overall function of the system in the present invention. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that at least this limitation of claims 1 and 10 is neither taught nor suggested by *Kardos et al.*

As such, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claims 1 and 10 is improper and the rejection should be reconsidered and withdrawn. Similarly, claims dependent on claims 1 and 10, namely claims 2-9 and 11-18, should be allowable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as indicated for claims 1 and 10. In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-18 each recite subject matter which is neither disclosed nor suggested in *Kardos et al.* and Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the above rejections.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin F. Turner
Registration No. 43,437

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

KFT:jf